

REMARKS

By the present Response, Applicant will have amended each of the independent claims in the present application to more clearly define Applicant's invention. In particular, the independent claims will have been amended to even more clearly render the same allowable, in accordance with the Examiner's indication.

In particular, each of claims 1, 27 and 34 will have been amended by incorporating therein the substantive features of claim 32. Similarly, claims 36 and 39 will have been amended by incorporating therein the recitations of claim 38. Accordingly, claims 32 and 38 will have been canceled.

In view of the herein contained amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the outstanding rejection together with an indication of the allowability of all the claims pending in the present application, in due course.

Initially, Applicant wishes to make of record a telephone interview conducted on June 28, 2004. The Examiner Interview Summary Form relating to this interview was forwarded to Applicant's representative by communication from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office dated July 6, 2004 and indicated that a Supplemental Reply will be filed. In addition to the comments contained in the substance of the interview attached to the above-noted Interview Form, Applicant adds the following remarks.

P19203.A13

During the above-noted interview, Applicant pointed out that the TOYOTA et al. reference relied upon does not have a memory that stores a table including a fixed address of the image receiving apparatus where the fixed address comprises a media access control address.

During the above-noted interview, Applicant's representative further asserted that the IDEHARA reference does not disclose two modes of transmission, the direct transmission and the indirect transmission in the manner set forth in the claims of the present application. Additionally, Applicant's representative set forth that there was no reason or motivation to utilize the teachings of REED et al. in IDEHARA and that there is no reason for either of TOYOTA et al. or IDEHARA to relate to or to require a changeable IP address. While REED et al. may very well teach a changeable IP address, there is no reason to use this feature in the combination of TOYOTA et al. and IDEHARA. Applicant has not invented the concept of a changeable IP address or of a media access control address. However, the utilization of a changeable IP address and a fixed address that corresponds to an MAC (media access control) address in the various combinations recited in Applicant's claims is not taught by the references relied upon. These arguments and distinctions between the references and the present invention were set forth during the above-noted interview.

During the above-noted interview, the Examiner indicated that if claims 32 and 38 would be amended as discussed and incorporated into the independent claims, the

P19203.A13

independent claims would be allowable. In this regard, while Applicant merely discussed claim 1, it is assumed that similar reasons apply to the other independent claims.

By the present Response and without acquiescing in the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has revised claims 32 and 38 and incorporated the substantive recitations thereof into each of the independent claims as appropriate.

During the above-noted interview, the Examiner also requested that Applicant clarify where the "detector recited in claim 32 falls at in the whole system process". In this regard, the Examiner's attention is directed to Fig. 8 and particularly to steps 803 and 804 of Fig. 8 which describe the operation of the determining section 502 schematically illustrated in Fig. 5. The Examiner's attention is further respectfully also directed to the disclosure starting from the last line of page 16 through line 13 of page 18.

During the above-noted interview, the Examiner also requested that Applicant elaborate on the portion of claim 1 that recites "in response to the IP address not being obtained by the processor" and elaborate on what the reasons are for the IP address to not be obtained.

In response, Applicant notes that according to a feature of the present invention, the transmitter determines whether or not the IP address is obtained by the processor in accordance with the detection of a specific mark within the destination data. In the non-limiting example used in the present application, the specific mark can be the @ character.

P19203.A13

In other words, if the specific mark is not included in the destination data (i.e., step 804 "only user name" YES), then further processing (ST 809) continues. In particular, further processing continues via either steps 810-814 or 815-819, and direct transmission can be performed using the IP address which is obtained from the memory at step 814. When data is transmitted directly without a server, SMTP transmission is performed to a destination terminal utilizing the IP address. Under such circumstances of course the destination terminal has to be provided with appropriate software for performing SMTP in order to directly receive the data. According to a feature of the present invention, the IP address is obtained from the memory utilizing the user name and the IP address is utilized to directly designate a destination terminal.

On the other hand, when the specific mark is included within a destination address, data is transmitted to a server to transmit the data to the destination terminal (ST 805-808). In particular, if the specific mark is included, the data is transmitted to a server designated by the name appearing immediately after the specific mark. That server can forward the transmitted data to the destination terminal.

Thus, Applicant has, by the present Response, and in accordance with the indication in the Examiner's Interview Summary Form, incorporated the features of claims 32 into each of claims 1, 27 and 34 and incorporated the limitations of claim 38 into each of claims 36 and 39. Applicant has further explained the various items set forth by the Examiner.

P19203.A13

Accordingly, Applicant has provided clear evidence of the patentability of the claims in the present application and respectfully requests an indication to such effect in due course.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicant has made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believes that he has now done so. Applicant has made of record a telephone interview conducted between Applicant's undersigned representative and the Examiner. Applicant has amended the claims in accordance with the indication by the Examiner that this would place the claims in condition for allowance, without acquiescing in the propriety of the rejection. Applicant has further amplified the features of the invention requested by the Examiner in the above-noted interview. Accordingly, Applicant has provided a clear evidentiary basis supporting the patentability of all the claims in the present application and respectfully requests an indication to such effect in due course.

Any amendments to the claims which have been made in this amendment, and which have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding this Response, or the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

William F. Reg BN-33630
Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

16